

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of:)	
Shunpei YAMAZAKI et al.)	Group Art Unit: 2815
Application No.: 08/520,079)	Examiner: Jay C. Kim
Filed: August 28, 1995)	Confirmation No.: 1321
For: SEMICONDUCTOR CIRCUIT FOR)	
ELECTRO-OPTICAL DEVICE AND)	
METHOD OF MANUFACTURING THE)	
SAME)	

AFTER FINAL RESPONSE**Mail Stop AF**

United States Patent and Trademark Office
 Customer Service Window
 Randolph Building
 401 Dulany Street
 Alexandria, VA 22314

Dear Sir:

The Office Action mailed October 12, 2011, has been received and its contents carefully noted. This response is filed within three months of the mailing date of the Office Action and therefore is believed to be timely without extension of time. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that this response is being timely filed.

Claims 87, 90, 123 and 126 are pending in the present application, of which claims 87 and 123 are independent. For the reasons set forth in detail below, all claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

Paragraph 2 of the Office Action rejects claims 87, 90, 123 and 126 as obvious based on the combination of U.S. Patent No. 5,275,851 to Fonash and U.S. Patent No. 5,650,664 to Sakamoto. The rejection is traversed for the reasons advanced in detail below.

As stated in MPEP §§ 2142-2144.04, to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some reason, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. Obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is